



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant	Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation	County	Monterey
Project Title	Addressing Critical Gaps in the IRWM Plan for the Greater Monterey County Region	Grant Request	\$ 244,730
		Total Project Cost	\$ 351,976

Project Description The RWMG is requesting funds to address critical information gaps in the GMC IRWMP in order to make it a more effective planning document for the region. The requested planning grant funds will enable the RWMG to strengthen and improve certain elements of IRWM planning; including collecting and assessing data on environmental water needs to ensure future protection, restoration, and improvement of aquatic, riparian, and watershed resources within the region. Two other important regional issues that are included in this planning effort are wildfires and “food safety.”

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	6
DAC Involvement	6
Schedule	4
Budget	8
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	29

- **Work Plan** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The score is based on the following: (1) The Proposal states that funds requested will be used to address gaps that the Greater Monterey (GM) region feels will “render the Plan less than adequate as a meaningful planning document for the GM region”; however, the Work Plan does not address how the tasks proposed will improve specific standards or result in a standards compliant IRWM Plan. (2) The Work Plan does not include information about how the tasks in this Proposal are unique and will build on the tasks funded through Round 1 Planning grant. (3) The need for this work is not well justified. For example, Subtask 3a: Provide technical assistance in fiscal management and operator training for water/wastewater systems, is outside of the scope of IRWM planning. It is unclear why Task 5 cannot be accomplished through the existing stakeholder process. (4) The submitted Work Plan is not sufficiently detailed to be the scope of work in a grant agreement.
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Work Plan, Task 3 (Increased Technical Assistance to DACs) lack subtask specificity, and there is no discussion about how this work will facilitate and support sustained DAC participation in the IRWM planning process. Subtasks 3b and 3c are largely duplicative of Round 1 Planning grant’s Task 3, which is yet to be completed. No reference is made of DAC work currently addressed through grants from both DWR and the RWQCB.
- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and the Budget. The time allocated for Task 3 appears excessive given the scope of work and budget. Conversely, Task 8 (Interregional Planning) will likely take more time to be successful given the expansiveness and high level of interregional coordination required of such a project. Also, the Schedule does not contain milestones.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

- **Budget** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by sufficient rationale. The Budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule. The Budget for Task 1 (Administration) and Task 2 (Coordination) appears excessive because it accounts for 47% of the requested grant funding, and much of the work appears duplicative of work already funded in Round 1 Planning. The Budget does not provide enough clarity to distinguish work that will be completed by Subtask 2a from many other tasks that will have IRWM Plan Coordinator participation, which may lead to invoicing for funds for the same work item more than once.
- **Program Preference** The proposal sufficiently demonstrates that 12 of the 15 preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.